

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 202 607

PS 012 215

AUTHOR Goodwin, Judy
TITLE Evaluation of the Original Follow Through Program, 1979-1980. Technical Summary.
INSTITUTION Philadelphia School District, Pa. Office of Research and Evaluation.
PUB DATE Mar 81
NOTE 39p.; Tables contain some small print.
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; *Health Services; Low Income Groups; Mathematics; *Parent Participation; Primary Education; *Program Evaluation; Reading Improvement; *Social Services; *Staff Development; Tables (Data); Teacher Aides; Teacher Attitudes; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS *Project Follow Through

ABSTRACT

Results from the 1979-80 evaluation of Philadelphia's Follow Through program--part of a nationwide attempt to provide unique educational settings for low-income students in kindergarten through grade 3--are reported. The evaluation dealt with five components of the program: education, staff development, parent involvement, health and social services. Cross-sectional achievement data indicated that children in the Follow Through program outperformed Title I non-Follow Through children in both reading and mathematics at every grade level (1-3). Staff development information revealed that the majority of teachers and aides were satisfied with the services provided by resource/support personnel; priorities for future staff development were identified in the area of "dealing with suspected child abuse/neglect" for both teachers and aides, and "social behaviors, human relations" for aides. Parent involvement data indicated that a total of 24,679 parent volunteer hours were donated to the program, which averaged 11.62 hours per child enrolled. Health services information showed that 80% of the children received vision screening, 72% hearing screening, 50% growth screening, and 74% dental screening. Social service data indicated that 49% of the Follow Through families were identified as needing social service assistance and that 91% of these families received the necessary assistance. (Data tables are included for each component evaluated.) (Author/MP)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED202607

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

TECHNICAL SUMMARY

EVALUATION OF THE ORIGINAL FOLLOW THROUGH PROGRAM, 1979-1980

Report Prepared by:

Judy Goodwin

of the

Early Childhood Evaluation Unit

Report #8148

March, 1981

Irvin J. Farber
Director
Priority Operations
Evaluation Services

Thomas McNamara
Manager
Early Childhood
Evaluation

Bernard Solomon
Executive Director
Research and Evaluation

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*School District
of Philadelphia*

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PS 012215

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mr. Arthur W. Thomas, President

Mrs. Edward Oberholtzer, Vice President

Mr. Augustus Baxter

Mrs. Lawrence Boonin

Mr. Samuel H. Rubin

Robert M. Sebastian, Esq.

Mrs. Michael Stack

George Philip Stahl, Jr., Esq.

Dr. Nicholas Trolie

Dr. Michael P. Marcuse, Superintendent of Schools, Secretary and Treasurer

Mr. Charles A. Highsmith, Deputy Superintendent

Mrs. Leontine D. Scott
Director
Follow Through Programs

Dr. Constance E. Clayton
Associate Superintendent
Early Childhood Education

Mr. Thomas C. Rosica
Executive Director
Federal Programs

TECHNICAL SUMMARY

EVALUATION OF THE ORIGINAL FOLLOW THROUGH PROGRAM,

1979-1980

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Original Follow Through Program is a nationwide attempt to provide unique educational settings for low-income students in Kindergarten through Grade 3. It emphasizes planned variation in instructional approach, intensive parent and community involvement in school functioning, and special supportive services. Six of the seven models were still operating in Philadelphia in the 1979-1980 year: Bank Street, Behavior Analysis, Bilingual, EDC, Parent Implemented and Philadelphia Process.

In 1977-1978, when Title I funding sources (which also supported the original program in large measure in Philadelphia) decided to enforce strictly the educational deprivation criterion of that title - which is at variance with Follow Through Guidelines - the many children who were scoring above the 50th percentile in Reading became ineligible for continued participation.

ABSTRACT

The Follow Through Program was evaluated in terms of its educational, parent involvement, health and social service components. Cross-sectional achievement data indicated that the Total Follow Through Program outperformed the Title 1 Non-Follow Through group in both Reading and Mathematics at every grade level (1-3).

Classroom observation data revealed that all levels of staff were primarily engaged in small group or individualized instruction, with the exception of teachers in the EDC model.

Staff development information showed that teachers received staff development most frequently through "informal communications," while aides most frequently received staff development during "faculty meeting time." The overwhelming majority of teachers and aides were satisfied with the services provided by resource/support personnel. Priorities for future staff development were in the area of "dealing with suspected child abuse/ neglect" for both teachers and aides, and "social behaviors, human relations" for aides.

Parent involvement data indicated that a total of 24,679 parent volunteer hours were donated to the program, which averaged 11.62 hours per child enrolled.

Health services information showed that 80% of the children received vision screenings, 72% hearing screenings, 50% growth screenings and 74% dental screenings. Of the children screened, 100% found to have problems

were referred for treatment. By the end of the year 39% were reported as having completed treatment or as being under treatment. On the other hand, 97% of the children referred for mental health services were observed, tested or evaluated by the end of the year.

Social Service Data indicated that 49% of Follow Through families were identified as in need of social service assistance and that 91% of these families received the necessary assistance.

TECHNICAL SUMMARY

EVALUATION OF THE ORIGINAL FOLLOW THROUGH PROGRAM, 1979-1980

I. CROSS-SECTIONAL ACHIEVEMENT DATA

A. Grade One Performance (See Table 1)

Summary Statement/Table 1: In Grade 1, Total Follow Through (TFT) had significantly higher mean scores than Total Non-Follow Through (TNF) in both Reading and Mathematics. When Follow Through groupings were compared with their respective Non-Follow Through (NFT) district groupings, Philadelphia Process (PP) and District 5 Follow Through (D5F) outperformed NFT in both Reading and Mathematics, while District 4 Follow Through exceeded NFT in Mathematics, but not in Reading.

When each model and District grouping was compared with TNF, PP, Bilingual and Parent Implemented outperformed the latter in both Reading and Mathematics, while¹ Behavior Analysis (BA) Behavior Analysis Adoption (BA/A), EDC, D4F and D5F exceeded TNF in Mathematics but not in Reading.

In sum, the Total Program and 3 of 7 models outperformed TNF in both Reading and Mathematics, while 3 additional models and 2 of 3 Follow Through District groupings exceeded TNF in Mathematics.

1.

The Nebinger School adopted the Behavior Analysis approach in 1977-78 in place of the Florida Parent Model and for the purpose of analysis is treated separately from the schools which have utilized the Behavior Analysis approach through the years.

Table 1A

Comparison Between Mean Scale Scores of Original Follow Through
Students and the Non-Follow Through Title I Comparison Group
in Grade 1 Reading on California Achievement Test (CAT), February 1980

Follow Through Groups				Non-Follow Through Title I Groups				Mean Differ- ence	Degrees of Freedom	t Test	Signif- icance Level
Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation				
PP	247	272	36	D1	261	262	36	10	506	3.09	<.05
D5F	197	273	33	D5	88	256	33	17	283	3.96	<.05
TFT	619	270	34	TNF	924	266	35	4	1541	2.29	<.05
BI	101	273	36	TNF	924	266	35	7	1023	2.00	<.05
PI	29	283	24	TNF	924	266	35	17	951	2.70	<.05
PP	247	272	36	TNF	924	266	35	6	1169	2.45	<.05

BI - Bilingual Model
PI - Parent Implemented Model
PP - Philadelphia Process Model
D5F - District 5 Follow Through

TFT - Total Follow Through
TNF - Total Non Follow Through
NFT - Non Follow Through

Table 1B

Comparison Between Mean Scale Scores of Original Follow Through
Students and the Non Follow Through Title I Comparison Group
in Grade 1 Mathematics on California Achievement Test (CAT), February 1980

Follow Through Groups				Non-Follow Through Title I Groups				Mean Differ- ence	Degrees of Freedom	t Test	Signif- icance Level
Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation				
PP	245	246	25	D 1	268	239	25	7	511	3.11	< .05
D4F	57	260	32	D 4	209	243	23	17	264	4.53	< .05
D5F	196	246	22	D 5	92	233	25	13	286	4.35	< .05
TFT	618	246	24	TNF	941	239	25	7	1557	5.60	< .05
PP	245	246	25	TNF	941	239	25	7	1184	4.00	< .05
BA/A	17	250	21	TNF	941	239	25	11	956	1.83	< .05
D4F	57	260	32	TNF	941	239	25	21	996	6.00	< .05
D5F	196	246	22	TNF	941	239	25	7	1135	3.50	< .05
EDC	132	241	21	TNF	941	239	25	5	1071	2.22	< .05
PI	28	247	18	TNF	941	239	25	8	967	1.68	< .05
BA	57	260	32	TNF	941	239	25	21	996	6.00	< .05
BI	100	245	23	TNF	941	239	25	6	1039	2.18	< .05

BA = Behavior Analysis
BA/A = Behavior Analysis Adoption (Nebinger School)
BI = Bilingual
EDC = Educational Development Center
PI = Parent Implemented

PP = Philadelphia Process
D4F = District 4 Follow Through
D5F = District 5 Follow Through
TFT = Total Follow Through
TNF = Total Non Follow Through
NFT = Non Follow Through

B. Grade Two Performance (See Table 2)

Summary Statement/Table 2: In Grade 2, TFT also had significantly higher mean scores than TNF in both Reading and Mathematics. When Follow Through groupings were compared with their respective NFT district groupings, EDC and D2F outperformed NFT in both Reading and Mathematics, while D4F exceeded NFT in Mathematics, but not in Reading.

When each model and district grouping was compared with TNF, EDC, BA, BI and D2F outperformed TNF in both Reading and Mathematics, while PP exceeded TNF in Reading but not in Mathematics and BA/A, BS and D5F outperformed TNF in Mathematics but not in Reading.

In sum, the Total Program, 3 of 7 models and 1 of 6 Follow Through District groupings outperformed TNF in both Reading and Mathematics, while 3 additional models and 1 additional District grouping exceeded TNF in either Reading or Mathematics.

Table 2A

Comparison Between Mean Scale Scores of Original Follow Through
Students and the Non Follow Through Title I Comparison Group
in Grade 2 Reading on California Achievement Test (CAT), February 1980

Follow Through Groups				Non-Follow Through Title I Groups				Mean Differ- ence	Degrees of Freedom	t Test	Signif- icance Level
Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation				
D2F	116	317	55	D2	146	298	30	19	260	.68	<.05
EDC	82	313	38	D6	80	299	31	14	160	2.50	<.05
TFT	504	309	44	TNF	935	302	35	7	1437	3.07	<.05
PP	112	310	41	TNF	935	302	35	8	1045	2.22	<.05
D2F	116	317	55	TNF	935	302	55	15	1049	3.95	<.05
EDC	82	313	38	TNF	935	302	35	11	1015	2.62	<.05
BA	127	310	40	TNF	935	302	35	8	1060	2.47	<.05
BI	75	317	62	TNF	935	302	35	15	1008	3.29	<.05

BA = Behavior Analysis
BI = Bilingual
EDC = Educational Development Center
PP = Philadelphia Process
D2F = District 2 Follow Through

TFT = Total Follow Through
TNF = Total Non Follow Through
NFT = Non Follow Through

Table 2B

Comparison Between Mean Scale Scores of Original Follow Through Students and the Non Follow Through Title I Comparison Group in Grade 2 Mathematics on California Achievement Test (CAT), February 1980

Follow Through Group				Non-Follow Through Title I Groups				Mean Difference	Degrees of Freedom	t Test	Significance Level
Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation				
D2F	116	286	34	D2	147	269	25	17	261	4.89	< .05
D4F	86	274	29	D4	173	268	28	6	257	1.65	< .05
EDC	83	277	22	D6	82	268	27	9	163	2.25	< .05
TFT	506	278	29	TNF	950	271	26	7	1454	4.32	< .05
D2F	116	286	34	TNF	950	271	26	15	1064	5.56	< .05
BA/A	34	282	29	TNF	950	271	26	11	982	2.49	< .05
D5F	74	278	26	TNF	950	271	26	7	1022	2.24	< .05
EDC	83	277	22	TNF	950	271	26	6	1031	2.10	< .05
BS	58	278	25	TNF	950	271	26	7	1006	1.92	< .05
BA	126	278	28	TNF	950	271	26	7	1074	2.99	< .05
BI	75	290	39	TNF	950	271	26	19	1023	5.86	< .05

BA = Behavior Analysis
 BA/A = Behavior Analysis Adoption (Nebinger School)
 BI = Bilingual
 BS = Bank Street
 EDC = Educational Development Center

D2F = District 2 Follow Through
 D4F = District 4 Follow Through
 D5F = District 5 Follow Through
 TFT = Total Follow Through
 TNF = Total Non Follow Through
 NTF = Non Follow Through

C. Grade Three Performance (See Table 3)

Summary Statement/Table 3: In Grade 3, TFT again had significantly higher mean scores than TNF in both Reading and Mathematics. When FT groupings were compared with their respective NFT district groupings, PP and D2F outperformed NFT in both Reading and Mathematics, while EDC exceeded NFT in Reading but not Mathematics, and BA/A and D4F exceeded NFT in Mathematics but not in Reading.

When each model and district grouping was compared with TNF, EDC, BA and D2F outperformed TNF in both Reading and Mathematics, while PP, BI and D5F exceeded TNF in Reading but not in Mathematics and BA/A exceeded TNF in Mathematics but not in Reading.

In sum, the Total Program, 2 of 7 models and 1 of 6 Follow Through District groupings outperformed TNF in both Reading and Mathematics, while 3 additional models and 1 additional District grouping exceeded TNF in either Reading or Mathematics.

Table 3A

Comparison Between Mean Scale Scores of Original Follow Through
Students and the Non Follow Through Title I Comparison Group
in Grade 3 Reading on California Achievement Test (CAT), February 1980

Follow Through Groups				Non-Follow Through Title I Groups				Mean Differ- ence	Degrees of Freedom	t Test	Signif- icance Level
Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation				
PP	81	340	44	D1	343	321	41	19	422	3.77	<.05
D2F	94	343	55	D2	150	312	37	31	242	5.30	<.05
EDC	104	345	50	D6	122	326	42	19	224	3.18	<.05
TFT	481	335	50	TNF	1106	322	42	13	1585	5.78	<.05
PP	81	340	44	TNF	1106	322	42	18	1185	3.57	<.05
D2F	94	343	55	TNF	1106	322	42	21	1198	4.44	<.05
D5F	37	339	36	TNF	1106	322	42	17	1141	2.38	<.05
EDC	104	345	50	TNF	1106	322	42	23	1208	5.35	<.05
BA	170	332	60	TNF	1106	322	42	10	1274	2.78	<.05
BI	84	337	35	TNF	1106	322	42	15	1188	3.25	<.05

BA = Behavior Analysis
BI = Bilingual
EDC = Educational Development Center
PP = Philadelphia Process
D2F = District 2 Follow Through
D5F = District 5 Follow Through

TFT = Total Follow Through
TNF = Total Non Follow Through
NFT = Non Follow Through

Table 3B

Comparison Between Mean Scale Scores at Original Follow Through
Students and the Non Follow Through Title I Comparison Group
in Grade 3 Mathematics on California Achievement Test (CAT), February 1980

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Non-Follow Through Title I Groups				Mean Differ- ence	Degrees of Freedom	t Test	Signif- icance Level
				Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation				
PP	81	307	33	D1	343	299	32	8	422	2.08	< .05
D2F	94	311	36	D2	192	297	29	14	244	3.37	< .05
BA/A	20	314	28	D3	20	292	39	22	38	1.96	< .05
D4F	144	304	34	D4	218	297	32	7	360	1.93	< .05
TFT	482	307	34	TNF	1109	301	32	6	1589	3.64	< .05
D2F	94	311	36	TNF	1109	301	32	10	1201	2.84	< .05
BA/A	20	314	28	TNF	1108	301	32	13	1127	1.77	< .05
EDC	106	307	37	TNF	1109	301	32	6	1213	1.88	< .05
BA	169	310	36	TNF	1109	301	32	9	1276	3.41	< .05

BA = Behavior Analysis
BA/A = Behavior Analysis Adoption (Nebinger School)
EDC = Educational Development Center
PP = Philadelphia Process
D2F = District 2 Follow Through

TFT = Total Follow Through
TNF = Total Non Follow Through
NFT = Non Follow Through

II. CLASSROOM OBSERVATION DATA

Summary Statement/Table 4: Teachers (50% to 79% of the time), aides (66% to 92%) and parent scholars (67% to 100%) across the models were observed engaged primarily in small group or individualized instruction, with the exception of EDC teachers (44% of the time).

For the most part, model-specific materials were observed in the model for which the observation item was intended. The major exception was "environmental projects", which were observed more frequently in Philadelphia Process, although the item was included for the Bank Street model.

As expected, the Behavior Analysis model which emphasizes positive reinforcement techniques had a much greater frequency of rewards (22 per observation) and specific praise (4 per observation) than any other model. The greatest degree of teacher structuring (organizing, questioning etc.) coupled with low pupil-to-pupil interaction was observed in the Bilingual model. In contrast, the Bank Street model had the lowest degree of teacher structuring and the highest pupil-to-pupil interaction -- a desirable goal for this model. Philadelphia Process, on the other hand, had a lower degree of structuring than most of the models and pupil-to-pupil interaction was minimal (4% of the observations).

Table 4
Classroom Observation Routine (COR) Data

VARIABLES	BS	BA	BI	BC	BT
STAFF - % of time present					
Teacher	100	100	100	100	100
Aide	73	83	100	73	83
Parent Scholar	0	37	35	18	29
REINFORCING INSTRUCTION	Aide PS	Aide PS	Aide PS	Aide PS	Aide PS
% of class assisted when present	23 -	32 31	22 17	11 15	23 11
Average # of pupils assisted when present	3	7 7	3 3	3 4	5 2
% of time spent assisting when present	67 -	92 100	64 80	67 100	77 86
SUBJECT MATTER (predominant)	Language Arts Reading Arithmetic	Reading Language Arts	Arithmetic Language Arts	Reading Arithmetic	Arithmetic Reading
LOCATION (Group Type)	N=4	N=14	N=14	N=14	N=14
Teacher	Small 40% Whole 23% Large 23%	Small 29% Individual 50% Whole 14% Large 7%	Small 57% Large 21% Whole 21%	Small 44% Whole 44% Large 13%	Small 62% Large 19% Individual 4% Whole 15%
Aide	N=3 Small 33% Whole 33% Individual 33%	N=12 Small 92% Other 8%	N=14 Small 71% Large 7% Whole 21%	N=17 Small 73% Whole 8% Individual 8% Other 8%	N=21 Small 71% Large 10% Whole 10% Individual 5% Other 5%
Parent Scholar	N=0	N=3 Individual 100%	N=5 Small 60% Individual 20% Whole 20%	N=3 Small 67% Large 33%	N=6 Small 83% Whole 17%
MATERIALS		PERCENTAGE OF OBSERVATIONS			
Library Center	0	0	36	63	42
2+ Activity Centers	75	86	100	88	100
Child-made charts, graphs	25	36	0	31	15
SAPA kits	0	0	0	0	63
Attendance board	30	0	0	0	12
Choice board	30	0	0	0	0
Job Chart	75	0	0	0	8
Token Box	0	86	14	0	0
Programmed workbooks	0	71	0	6	38
Ethnic materials	0	71	86	19	34
Environmental projects	25	7	0	13	31
Stories	30	0	21	6	8
TEACHERS		AVERAGE FREQUENCY PER OBSERVATION			
Read	0.2	0.2	1.5	0.1	0.7
Organized	42	37	32	37	35
Questioned	15	16	46	41	32
Gave information	6	6	16	3	4
Approved	3	11	36	9	6
Praised (specific)	0.2	4	1	0	1
Recorded	0	22	1	0	0
Commented on Behavior	2	3	0	2	1
CHILDREN					
Responded to teacher questions	44	40	32	38	39
		PERCENTAGE OF OBSERVATIONS			
Wrote on original piece	25	0	7	0	0
Read silently or aloud	0	29	7	44	19
Measured or compared	0	0	0	23	8
Observed events or objects	0	0	0	6	4
Classified	0	0	0	0	8
Applied numbers	0	7	0	38	31
Add, subtract, multiply, divide	0	0	36	44	8
Responded to IF, HOW, WHY, or CONDITIONAL questions	23	7	79	44	42
Talked to other children	30	21	7	44	4

III. STAFF DEVELOPMENT DATA

A. Experience of Staff

TABLE 5

Percentages of Teachers and Aides who had 1-10 Years of Experience. Information is Based Upon 28 Returns from Teachers (62%) and 25 Returns from Aides (100%)

Number of Years	Early Childhood Classroom Experience		Length of Time with Follow Through Program	
	Teachers	Aides	Teachers	Aides
	%	%	%	%
Less than ONE YEAR	0	4	0	12
1 - 3 YEARS	0	4	14	0
4 - 6 YEARS	18	4	18	8
7 - 10 YEARS	11	32	39	36
More Than 10 YEARS	71	52	29	36

Summary Statement: The majority of Teachers (71%) and Aides (52%) had more than 10 years of early childhood classroom experience and served for at least 7 years in the Follow Through Program (68% and 72% respectively), i.e., the "7-10 years" and "more than 10 years" categories combined.

B. Extent of Staff Development

TABLE 6

Percentages of Teachers and Aides Who Received
Different Types of Staff Development

Type of Staff Development	1-5 Times/Yr.		6-10 Times/Yr.		Over 10 Times/Year		None	
	Teach-ers	Aides	Teach-ers	Aides	Teach-ers	Aides	Teach-ers	Aides
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Workshops — (Formal Staff Development Sessions)	50	36	36	56	0	8	11	0
Classroom Demonstrations/On-site Training	43	44	25	28	11	20	18	4
Group Meetings	39	28	25	40	21	32	7	0
Individual Conferences	32	28	32	28	14	8	14	24
Informal Communications	21	32	7	20	54	24	7	8
Written Communications (Memos, Newsletters, etc.)	29	24	21	24	36	32	7	8
Faculty Meeting-time — Staff Development	36	20	21	28	25	48	18	0

Summary Statement: The majority of teachers and aides reported receiving all of the above types of staff development. For teachers (54%) the most frequent form of staff development appears to be through "informal communications" (over 10 times/yr.) whereas for aides (48%) "faculty meeting time" appears to be the most frequent means of receiving staff development.

Summary Statement/Table 7 - The overwhelming majority of teachers and aides were satisfied with the services provided by resource/support personnel. The one area where there seemed to be less satisfaction amongst the teachers was with information regarding administrative decisions and procedures.

A particularly high percentage of Teachers (82%) were satisfied with "support given to individual concerns" and "locating available resource materials," while Aides (96%) were particularly satisfied with "conducting group meetings."

Summary Statement/Table 8 - The majority of Teachers and Aides reported experiencing "moderate" to "great" changes in their classroom functioning as a result of staff development in 11 areas. The area of "parent involvement" appears to have made the greatest impact (Teachers, 71% Aides, 84%).

There were only 4 areas of staff development where neither Teachers nor Aides experienced significant changes: special education issues, desegregation, learning about commercial materials and dealing with suspected child abuse/neglect.

C. Degree of Satisfaction with Staff Development

Table 7

Percentages of Teachers and Aides who Expressed Satisfaction with the Services Provided By Resource/Support Personnel

Type of Service Provided by Support Personnel	Satisfied		Not Satisfied	
	Teachers	Aides	Teachers	Aides
	%	%	%	%
Conducts Workshops	79	92	14	4
Conducts Group Meetings	79	96	21	0
Informs you of Program Activities and Changes	79	92	21	8
Informs you of School Board Administrative Decisions and Procedures	46	80	29	12
Provides Classroom Demonstrations, or other On-site training	68	92	25	8
Locates available Resource Materials	82	92	18	8
Gives Support to Individual Concerns/Interpersonal Relationships	82	88	18	12
Gives Support in Solving Classroom Management Problems	61	92	18	8
Gives Suggestions about the effective use Curriculum	75	92	21	4
Offers Support Working with Paraprofessionals & Volunteers	71	88	18	8
Offers Support in Parent Involvement	75	88	14	4
Assists in Completion and Submission of Required Data and other Information	71	76	21	12
Gives Support in Helping to Individualize Instruction and/or Promote Small Group Instru.	75	92	21	4
Fosters Team Learning and Instruction	61	80	25	8

D. Extent to Which Staff Perceived Changes in Classroom Functioning

Table 8

Percentages of Teachers and Aides who Experienced
Changes in Classroom Functioning as a Result of
Staff Development

AREA OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT	EXTENT OF CHANGE					
	LITTLE		MODERATE		GREAT	
	T	A	T	A	T	A
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Social Behaviors, Human Relations and/or Interpersonal Skills	36	12	46	72	4	12
Parent Involvement	21	4	50	44	21	40
Using the Creative Arts to Enrich the Curric.	36	4	36	52	14	20
Child Growth and Development	36	8	36	56	4	20
Community Resources	32	16	39	48	7	16
Curriculum Development	29	8	39	56	18	28
Classroom Management	39	12	25	48	18	32
Model/Option Related Training	29	32	50	32	7	16
Minimal Essentials -- Math and Language Skills	32	12	43	56	14	20
Helping Children Take Tests	39	8	43	52	4	24
Making Effective Use of Your Physical Space	36	20	29	52	21	20
Improving the Basic Skills or Basic Skills Readiness	39	8	29	52	18	24
Utilization of Personnel	32	20	36	52	18	20
Individualizing Instruction	39	8	32	56	18	28
Special Education Issues	21	20	25	36	7	8
Using Teacher/Resource Center Facilities	29	12	36	36	18	44
Small Group Instruction	32	4	39	36	18	56
Desegregation	18	12	4	28	4	8
Learning About Commercial Materials	29	24	36	40	7	8
Team Teaching/Learning	29	12	18	48	14	28
Learning to Share Group Expertise	32	16	32	44	21	40
Dealing with Suspected Child Abuse/Neglect	36	36	4	32	7	0

Summary Statement/Table 9 - Forty-three percent of the Teachers and 48% of the Aides selected staff development in "dealing with suspected child abuse/neglect" as a priority for future staff development. Aides (48%) also selected staff development in the area of "social behaviors, human relations" as a priority.

Summary Statement/Table 10 - Most teachers and Aides appeared unwilling to participate in staff development after school hours without reimbursement. However, 43% of the teachers and 48% of the Aides indicated a willingness to participate in staff development without reimbursement in the area of "dealing with suspected child abuse/neglect."

E. Priority Areas for Future Staff Development

Table 9

Percentages of Teachers and Aides Who Selected the Following Staff Development Areas as Priorities for Future Staff Development

AREA OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT	Teachers	Aides
	X	X
Social Behaviors, Human Relations and/or Interpersonal Skills	36	48
Parent Involvement	18	32
Using the Creative Arts to Enrich the Curric.	36	44
Child Growth and Development	32	24
Community Resources	11	20
Curriculum Development	7	28
Classroom Management	21	32
Model/Option Related Training	7	8
Minimal Essentials — Math and Language Skills	18	36
Helping Children Take Tests	11	44
Making Effective Use of Your Physical Space	11	12
Improving the Basic Skills or Basic Skills Readiness	36	48
Utilization of Personnel	11	8
Individualizing Instruction	32	12
Special Education Issues	18	20
Using Teacher/Resource Center Facilities	18	20
Small Group Instruction	14	40
Desegregation	11	8
Learning About Commercial Materials	18	16
Team Teaching/Learning	7	24
Learning to Share Group Expertise	25	28
Dealing with Suspected Child Abuse/Neglect	43	48

F. Staff Development in which Staff Would Participate Without Reimbursement

Table 10

Percentages of Teachers and Aides Who Would be
Willing to Participate in the Following Staff
Development Areas Without Reimbursement After School Hours

AREA OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT	Teachers	Aides
	%	%
Social Behaviors, Human Relations and/or Interpersonal Skills	36	40
Parent Involvement	21	24
Using the Creative Arts to Enrich the Curric.	39	32
Child Growth and Development	18	20
Community Resources	4	16
Curriculum Development	25	24
Classroom Management	29	20
Model/Option Related Training	11	4
Minimal Essentials — Math and Language Skills	14	12
Helping Children Take Tests	7	40
Making Effective Use of Your Physical Space	18	12
Improving the Basic Skills or Basic Skills Readiness	32	40
Utilization of Personnel	14	12
Individualizing Instruction	29	36
Special Education Issues	25	20
Using Teacher/Resource Center Facilities	11	16
Small Group Instruction	14	24
Desegregation	14	16
Learning About Commercial Materials	18	12
Team Teaching/Learning	4	28
Learning to Share Group Expertise	21	20
Dealing with Suspected Child Abuse/Neglect	43	48

IV. PARENT INVOLVEMENT DATA

Table 11

Extent of Parent Participation: Total Number and Percent of Parent Attendance Hours at Workshops and Volunteer Hours in Other Activities

Volunteer Hours	TYPE OF PARENT INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITY								
	Workshops	Meetings	Classroom Participation	Class Trips	Work at Home	Fund Raising	Social Activities	Other	Total
Number of Volunteer Hours	5582.5	5344.25	9409.25	806.50	332	428.75	34	2,742	24,679.25
Percent of Total Volunteer Hours	22.6%	21.7%	38.1%	3.3%	1.3%	1.7%	0.1%	11.0%	
No of Hours Per Child on Roll	2.93	2.43	4.28	0.37	0.15	0.20	0.02	1.25	11.62

Legend: W-Workshops, M-Meetings, C-Classroom Participation, T-Classstrip Participation, H-Work done at home, F-Fund Raising, S-Social Activities, O-Other.

Summary Statement: The total number of parent volunteer hours for the 1979-1980 year amounted to 24,679.25 which averaged 11.62 hours per child enrolled. The highest contribution in terms of hours per child was in Classroom Participation (4.28 hours). Attendance at Workshops was the next highest category (2.93 hours), and then Meetings (2.43 hours).

V. HEALTH SERVICES

A. Medical and Dental Services

1. Screenings

Table 12

Numbers (N) and Percentages of Original Follow
Through Children Who Received Medical and Dental
Screenings

Program Enroll- ment ¹	Eligible		Physical ² Examina- tions		Completed Screenings ³							
					Vision		Hearing		Growth		Dental	
N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2479	485	20	905	37	1994	80	1785	72	1274	51	1829	74

1. Program enrollment was based on the enrollment figure as of the end of March, 1980.
2. Physical examinations are mandated in grade 1.
3. Except for dental services, health screenings are mandated in grades 1, 2, and 3.
Dental examinations are provided in grades K, 1, 2, 3.

Summary Statement: Thirty-seven (37%) of the children in the Follow program received physical examinations (i.e. primarily children in grade 1 where there is a school district requirement), while 80% were screened for vision, 72% for hearing, 51% for growth and 74% for dental problems.

2. Treatment

Table 13

Numbers (N) and Percentages of Children Found to have Problems and Treatment Figures

Problems	Found Through Screenings or Physical Examination	Referred		Treatment Completed or Under Treatment	
	N	N	%	N	%
Vision (Screening)	326	326	100	140	43%
Hearing (Screening)	46	46	100	19	41%
Growth (Screening)	49	49	100	27	55%
Medical (Physical Examination)	243	243	100	69	28%
Dental (Examination)	686	686	100	271	40%
Total	1350	1350	100	526	39%

Summary Statement: Of those children who were screened, 100% found to have problems were referred for treatment; by the end of the year a total of 34% of the referrals made either completed treatment or were under treatment. Forty-three percent were treated for vision problems, 41% for hearing problems, 55% for growth problems, 28% for physical problems and 40% for dental problems.

B. Mental Health Services

1. Number of Contacts/Types of Contacts

Table 14

Number and Type of Contacts Undertaken by Mental Health Consultants for Nine Schools with Contracted Mental Health Services

S C H O O L	Hours of Service	Number of Children Referred	Children Screened/ Tested/ Evaluated	Children Participa- ting in Counseling/ Therapy Services	Fre- quency	Number of Children Observed	Fre- quency	DIRECT SERVICES						INDIRECT SERVICES		
								Faculty	Fre- quency	Other School/ Program Personnel	Fre- quency	Parents	Fre- quency	Staff Dev. & Work- shops	Planning	Parent Workshops
(1)	30.0	10	9	7	17	1	1	5	3	4	4	2	3	2	0	1
(2)	9.5	4	4	0	0	4	9	2	7	0	0	3	3	0	0	0
(3)	21.0	9	9	6	12	7	10	7	26	7	14	1	3	2	1	0
(4)	84	21	21	3	10	11	11	10	37	5	3	9	11	2	3	1
(5)	41	27	26	0	0	9	21	7	38	6	31	0	0	3	3	2
(6)	36.75	18	18	10	10	17	17	6	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	0
(7)	42	12	12	6	24	6	7	6	32	14	17	2	2	9	7	1
(8)	31	12	12	9	16	4	4	5	15	2	2	3	4	0	1	1
(9)	161.5	24	24	7	36	9	15	9	39	6	12	4	7	0	3	0
Total	476.75	137	133	48	125	68	95	57	215	44	83	24	33	19	20	6

Summary Statement: Of the 137 children referred for mental health services, 133 (97% were screened, tested or evaluated). Forty-eight children received counseling, 68 children were observed and 298 contacts were made with school personnel on an individual basis.

In addition, indirect services included 19 staff development workshops for staff and 6 workshops for parents.

2. Number of referrals

Table 15

Numbers of Children Referred in Relation
to Presenting Problems

Presenting Problem	Number of Children Referred
Speech	4
Neurological	7
Visual Motor	4
Motor	2
Perceptual Motor	4
Developmental Delay	3
Learning	19
Specific Learning Disability	1
Attention Span/Distractibility	8
Slow Learner	1
Emotional (Mild)	9
Withdrawn	3
Behavior	9
High Activity Level	1
Immaturity	2
Family Problem	1
Absenteeism	3
Problem Not Reported	56
	TOTAL 137

Summary Statement: Learning problems (29 children) appear to represent the major category for mental health referrals. Other areas where there were a number of referrals were emotional, behavior and neurological problems.

VI. SOCIAL SERVICES

A. Families in Need//assisted

Table 16

Number and Percent of Families Identified as
Being in Need of Services and the Number Provided
Social Service Assistance

FAMILIES IDENTIFIED IN NEED OF SERVICES								
Program	Average Number of Families	Proportion of Total Program Participants in Need of Service		Proportion of Identified Families for Whom Assistance was Completed		Average Number of Families Assisted Monthly		
						Assistance Completed	Assistance Not Completed	Total
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Original Follow Through	2,082	1,020	49	926	91	93	91	102

Summary Statement: Forty-nine percent (49%) of Follow Through families, i.e., a total of slightly over a thousand were identified as in need of social service assistance and 91% of these families received the necessary assistance. On an average monthly basis almost all of the families in need (91%) were rendered assistance.

B. Number and Percent of Total Contacts/Type of Contact

Table 17

**Number and Percent of Total Contacts Undertaken by
Parent Involvement Coordinators to Assist Families
in Need of Social Service**

Purpose of Contacts	TYPES OF CONTACTS										
	Setting of Contacts with Parents			Contacts with Community Agencies & Program Personnel						Total Contacts	
	Contacts by Phone Only	Home Visits	Conferences at School or Site	Sharing/Exch. Information w/ Community Agencies	Referrals	Acting on Child/Adult's Behalf	Conference w/Program Personnel	Other (e.g., letters)			
Classroom Attendance Behavior of Child	718	1465	169	84	494	264	904	38	4138	21	
Health Services for Child (Med/Den/Nutr.)	714	1288	268	139	515	468	619	81	4092	21	
Mental Health Services for Child	69	175	80	34	72	43	131	20	628	3	
Progress Report of Child	214	446	105	40	81	84	201	33	1206	6	
Sharing Program Information with family	871	1080	475	99	71	84	198	999	3877	20	
Sharing Information About Community Ags.	384	440	246	172	40	86	212	876	2456	13	
Parent's Imple. Cont Trg. Education/Illness	349	191	156	49	40	16	106	16	823	4	
In/Abs-Termination Process & Recruitment	171	212	140	68	30	34	98	40	815	4	
Other	240	341	374	46	112	52	175	339	1619	8	
Total Percentage	3640	3538	2013	735	1475	1133	2644	2484	19674	100	
	19	28	10	4	8	6	13	13			

Summary Statement: Most specific social service contacts were made with parents, either through home visits (28%) or contacts by phone (19%). The types of contacts were primarily for the purpose of classroom attendance/behavior (21%), health services for the child (21%) and sharing program information with the family (20%). A total of 19,674 contacts were made for social service purposes.

C. Contacts Made for Specific Child Needs

Table 18

Number of Contacts Made by Parent Involvement
Coordinators to Alleviate Specific Child Needs

Purpose of Contact	CONTACTS UNDERTAKEN BY PARENT INVOLVEMENT COORDINATORS									
	Parents		Community Agencies		Program Staff		Number of Contacts		Total Contacts ¹	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Child Attendance/ Behavior of Child	2352	57	844	20	904	22	4100	99	4158	100
Child's Physical Health	2270	55	1122	27	619	15	4011	98	4092	100
Child's Mental Health	324	52	153	24	131	21	608	97	628	100
Child's Progress Report	765	63	205	17	201	16	1171	97	1206	100
Intake-Termination Process & Re- cruitment	523	64	154	19	98	12	775	95	815	100
Total	6,234	57	2,478	23	1,953	18	10,665	98	10,899	100

¹. Includes "Other" Category

Summary Statement: The majority of contacts (57%) made by parent involvement coordinators regarding specific child problems were with parents of children in the program, 23% were with community agencies and 18% with program staff. Over two thirds of the contacts were for child/attendance/behavior problems (4,158) and child's physical health (4,092).